

Preservation theorems for countable support forcing iterations

Chaz Schlindwein

Division of Mathematics and Computer Science

Lander University

Greenwood, South Carolina 29649, USA

`chaz@lander.edu`

February 1, 2008

1 Introduction

A major theme of [12] is preservation theorems for iterated forcing. These are theorems of the form “if $\langle P_\xi : \xi \leq \kappa \rangle$ is a countable support forcing iteration based on $\langle \dot{Q}_\xi : \xi < \kappa \rangle$ and each $\dot{Q}_\xi$ has property such-and-such then P_κ has property thus-and-so.” The archetypal preservation theorem is the Fundamental Theorem of Proper Forcing [12, chapter III], which states that if each $\dot{Q}_\xi$ is proper in $V[G_{P_\xi}]$ then P_κ is proper. Typically, the property enjoyed by P_κ ensures that either ω_1 is not collapsed, or that no new reals are added. In this paper we introduce two preservation theorems, one for not collapsing ω_1 and one for not adding reals, which include many of the

preservation theorems of [12] as special cases. We shall see that some preservation theorems from [12] which use revised countable support iteration are true also for countable support iteration; for example, we have that any countable support iteration of semi-proper forcings is semi-proper. These results lessen the importance of the concept of revised countable support iterations.

For preserving ω_1 , we introduce the class of hemi-proper forcings. This generalizes semi-properness, and, assuming CH, includes also Namba forcing and the forcing $P[S]$ consisting of all increasing countable sequences from S , ordered by reverse end-extension, where $S \subseteq S_0^2 =_{\text{def}} \{\alpha < \omega_2 : \text{cf}(\alpha) = \omega\}$ and S is stationary. This is the forcing notion used by Shelah in his solution to a problem of H. Friedman, namely the question of whether every stationary subset of S_0^2 may contain a closed subset of order-type ω_1 .

For not adding reals, we introduce μ -pseudo-completeness (our terminology clashes with the terminology of Shelah in this instance). The hypothesis of our preservation theorem is that each $\dot{Q}_\xi$ is μ -pseudo-complete relative to P_ξ , and the conclusion is that P_κ does not add any elements of ${}^\omega\mu$. We show that under CH, both Namba forcing and $P[S]$ satisfy the hypothesis of the theorem; for Namba forcing we require $\mu \in \{2, \omega\}$ and for $P[S]$ we allow any μ . Also Prikry forcing works for μ less than the measurable cardinal.

We also make an observation regarding the construction of models in which the continuum is larger than $\aleph_2$ via iterated forcing; this sort of construction, we observe, is not so difficult as has been previously believed.

Notation. Our notation follows [10], except as noted in definition 1.

We set M^P equal to the set (or class) of P -names which are in M . This is different from the class of names whose values are forced to be in M , and it is different from the class of names whose values are forced to be in $M[G_P]$ (of course, for any G_P and any name $\dot{x}$ which is forced to be in $M[G_P]$ there are $p \in G_P$ and $\dot{y} \in M^P$ such that $p \Vdash \dot{x} = \dot{y}$). The notation $\dot{P}_{\eta,\alpha}$ is used in the context of a forcing iteration $\langle P_\beta : \beta \leq \alpha \rangle$ based on $\langle \dot{Q}_\beta : \beta < \alpha \rangle$; it denotes a P_η -name characterized by $V[G_{P_\eta}] \models \text{“}\dot{P}_{\eta,\alpha} = \{p \restriction [\eta, \alpha) : p \restriction \eta \in G_{P_\eta} \text{ and } p \in P_\alpha\} \text{”}$. By $p \restriction [\eta, \alpha)$ we do not mean the check (with respect to P_η) of the restriction of p to the interval $[\eta, \alpha)$, but rather we mean the P_η -name for the function f with domain equal to $[\check{\eta}, \check{\alpha})$ such that $f(\check{\beta})$ is the P_η -name for the $\dot{P}_{\eta,\beta}$ -name corresponding to the P_β -name $p(\beta)$ (see [12, definition II.2.3, page 45]). We shall use such facts as $\mathbf{1} \Vdash \text{“}\dot{P}_{\eta,\alpha} \text{ is a poset;”}$ see [10] for a proof. We shall use the notation of [6] regarding forcing names; see [6, page 188].

2 Hemi-properness

In this section we introduce hemi-properness and show that hemi-properness is preserved under countable support iterations. As a warm-up, we show that semi-properness is preserved under countable support iterations.

Definition 1. Suppose $\langle P_\xi : \xi \leq \alpha \rangle$ is a countable support forcing iteration and $\eta < \alpha$. By $\dot{P}_{\eta,\alpha}^M$ we mean the name $\{\langle p \restriction [\eta, \alpha), p \restriction \eta \rangle : p \in P_\alpha \text{ and } p \restriction [\eta, \alpha) \in M^{P_\eta}\}$. This is in contrast with the object $\{\langle \dot{q}, p \rangle : p \in P_\eta \text{ and } p \Vdash \text{“}\dot{q} \in \dot{P}_{\eta,\alpha} \text{” and } \dot{q} \in M^{P_\eta}\}$. Notice that the assertion $r \Vdash_{P_\eta} \text{“}\dot{s} \in \dot{P}_{\eta,\alpha}^M \text{”}$ is

stronger than the assertion $r \Vdash \dot{s} \in \dot{P}_{\eta,\alpha} \cap M[G_{P_\eta}]$ and it is also different from $r \Vdash \dot{s} \in \dot{P}_{\eta,\alpha} \cap \check{M}$. By “ $\text{supt}(p)$ ” we mean $\{\beta \in \text{dom}(p) : p(\beta) \neq \mathbf{1}_{\dot{Q}_\beta}\}$. This is in contrast with [10], where “ $\text{supt}(p)$ ” was used to mean $\{\beta \in \text{dom}(p) : p \restriction \beta \Vdash \text{“}p(\beta) = \mathbf{1}_{\dot{Q}_\beta}\text{”}\}$.

In the following three lemmas we establish the basic facts about $\dot{P}_{\eta,\alpha}^M$.

Lemma 2. Suppose $\langle P_\xi : \xi \leq \kappa \rangle$ is a countable support forcing iteration and M is a countable elementary submodel of H_λ for some sufficiently large regular λ and N is a countable elementary substructure of H_θ , where θ is a regular cardinal greater than λ , and suppose $P_\kappa \in M \in N$. Suppose $\sigma \in N^{P_\kappa}$ and $\eta \in \kappa \cap M$ and $p \in P_\eta$ and $\dot{q} \in N^{P_\eta}$ and $p \Vdash \text{“}\sigma \in M[G_{P_\eta}]^{\dot{P}_{\eta,\kappa}}\text{”}$ and $\dot{q} \in \dot{P}_{\eta,\kappa}^M$. Then there is $\dot{r} \in N^{P_\eta}$ and $\tau \in N^{P_\eta}$ such that $p \Vdash \text{“}\dot{r} \in \dot{P}_{\eta,\kappa}^M\text{”}$ and $\dot{r} \leq \dot{q}$ and $\dot{r} \Vdash_{\dot{P}_{\eta,\kappa}} \text{“if } \sigma \text{ is an ordinal then } \sigma = \check{\tau} \text{”}$ and $\tau \in M[G_{P_\eta}]$.

Proof: Work in N (so we must not refer to p , which is not in N). Take $\mathcal{J} \subseteq \{s \in P_\eta : (\exists p(s) \in P_\kappa)(\exists \sigma(s) \in M^{P_\eta})(p(s) \restriction \eta = s \text{ and } p(s) \restriction [\eta, \kappa] \in M^{P_\eta} \text{ and } s \Vdash \text{“if } \dot{q} \in \dot{P}_{\eta,\kappa}^M \text{ and } \sigma \in M[G_{P_\eta}]^{\dot{P}_{\eta,\kappa}} \text{ then } p(s) \restriction [\eta, \kappa] = \dot{q} \text{ and } \sigma = \sigma(s)\text{”})\}$ a maximal antichain. For each $s \in \mathcal{J}$ take $\dot{r}(s) \in M^{P_\eta}$ and $\tau(s) \in M^{P_\eta}$ such that $\mathbf{1} \Vdash_{P_\eta} \text{“if } \dot{q} \in \dot{P}_{\eta,\kappa}^M \text{ and } \sigma \in M[G_{P_\eta}]^{\dot{P}_{\eta,\kappa}} \text{ then } \dot{r}(s) \leq p(s) \restriction [\eta, \kappa] \text{ and } \dot{r}(s) \Vdash \text{“if } \sigma(s) \text{ is an ordinal then } \sigma(s) = \tau(s)\text{” and } \tau(s) \text{ is an ordinal.”}$ For each $s \in \mathcal{J}$ take $\mathcal{J}(s) \in M$ such that $\mathcal{J}(s)$ is a maximal antichain of $\{s' \in P_\eta : (\exists p'(s') \in P_\kappa)(p'(s') \restriction \eta = s' \text{ and } s' \Vdash \text{“}p'(s') \restriction [\eta, \kappa] = \dot{r}(s)\text{”})\}$. Take $p^*(s) \in M^{P_\eta}$ to be forced to be a function with domain equal to the interval $[\check{\eta}, \check{\kappa})$ such that $(\forall \gamma \in [\eta, \kappa))(\forall s' \in \mathcal{J}(s))(s' \Vdash \text{“}p^*(s)(\check{\gamma}) = p'(s')(\check{\gamma})\text{”})$. Now take $\dot{r} = \{\langle p^*(s), s \rangle : s \in \mathcal{J}\}$ and take $\tau \in V^{P_\eta}$ such that $(\forall s \in \mathcal{J})(s \Vdash \text{“}\tau =$

$\tau(s)$). We are done.

Lemma 3. *Suppose $\langle P_\xi : \xi \leq \kappa \rangle$ is a countable support forcing iteration and λ is a sufficiently large cardinal and M is a countable elementary substructure of H_λ . Suppose $\eta \in \kappa \cap M$ and $\{P_\kappa, \eta\} \subseteq M$. Suppose also $p \in P_\eta$ and $p \Vdash \dot{q} \in \dot{P}_{\eta, \kappa}^M$. Then $p \Vdash \text{supt}(\dot{q}) \subseteq \check{M}$.*

Proof: Recall by definition 1 that we are using “supt” in the sense of [6] rather than in the sense of [10]. Given $r \leq p$, take $s \in P_\kappa$ such that $s \restriction \eta \leq r$ and $s \restriction \eta \Vdash \dot{q} = s \restriction [\eta, \kappa]$ and $s \restriction [\eta, \kappa] \in M^{P_\eta}$. We have $s \restriction \eta \Vdash \text{supt}(\dot{q}) \subseteq \text{supt}(s \restriction [\eta, \kappa]) \subseteq \check{X}$ where $X = \text{supt}(s)$. Now, $X \cap [\eta, \kappa]$ is a countable element of M , hence it is a subset of M . We are done.

Corollary 4. *Suppose $\langle P_\alpha : \alpha \leq \kappa \rangle$ is a countable support iteration and M is a countable elementary submodel of H_λ and $\eta < \kappa$ and $\{P_\kappa, \eta\} \subseteq M$. Suppose $p \in P_\eta$ and $p \Vdash \dot{q} \in \dot{P}_{\eta, \kappa}^M$. Then there is $r \in P_\kappa$ such that $r \restriction \eta = p$ and $p \Vdash r \restriction [\eta, \kappa] = \dot{q}$.*

Remark: Notice that this is false if we weaken the hypothesis “ $p \Vdash \dot{q} \in \dot{P}_{\eta, \kappa}^M$ ” to “ $p \Vdash \dot{q} \in \dot{P}_{\eta, \kappa} \cap M[G_{P_\eta}]$.”

Observation: It has been remarked by Roitman that there is a difficulty in obtaining a model in which the continuum is larger than $\aleph_2$ using countable support iterations (see [1, page 56]). Notice that this difficulty disappears with our approach. The difficulty arises because CH fails in some intermediate model, and the traditional method of proving preservation theorems for countable support involves examining the behavior of $\dot{P}_{\eta, \kappa}$ in the model $V[G_{P_\eta}]$. However, in our approach, so long as CH holds in the ground

model, the fact that it fails in intermediate models is immaterial.

Lemma 5. *Suppose $\eta < \beta < \alpha$ and $p \Vdash_{P_\eta} \dot{q} \in \dot{P}_{\eta,\alpha}^M$ and $\{\eta, \beta, P_\alpha\} \subseteq M$, where M is a countable elementary substructure of H_λ . Then $p \Vdash_{P_\eta} \dot{q} \restriction \beta \Vdash_{\dot{P}_{\eta,\beta}} \dot{q} \restriction [\beta, \alpha) \in \dot{P}_{\beta,\alpha}^M$.*

Proof: Given $p' \leq p$ take $r \in P_\alpha$ such that $r \restriction \eta \leq p'$ and $r \restriction [\eta, \alpha) \in M^{P_\eta}$ and $r \restriction \eta \Vdash \text{“} r \restriction [\eta, \alpha) = \dot{q} \text{”}$. Then we have $r \restriction \beta \Vdash \text{“} \dot{q} \restriction [\beta, \alpha) = r \restriction [\beta, \alpha) \in \dot{P}_{\beta,\alpha}^M \text{”}$. Hence $r \restriction \eta \Vdash \text{“} r \restriction [\eta, \beta) \Vdash \dot{q} \restriction [\beta, \alpha) \in \dot{P}_{\beta,\alpha}^M \text{”}$ by [10, section 3]. Because p' was an arbitrary condition below p we are done.

We assume familiarity with the definition of “semi-proper” from [12, chapter X]. Here we introduce the appropriate induction hypothesis for showing that semi-properness is preserved under countable support iterations.

Definition 6. *Suppose $\langle P_\xi : \xi \leq \alpha \rangle$ is a countable support iteration. We say that P_α is strictly semi-proper iff whenever λ is a sufficiently large regular cardinal and $\eta < \alpha$ and M is a countable elementary substructure of H_λ and $\{P_\alpha, \eta\} \subseteq M$ and $\dot{q} \in V^{P_\eta}$ and $p \in P_\eta$ and $p \Vdash \text{“} \omega_1 \cap M[G_{P_\eta}] = \omega_1 \cap M$ and $\dot{q} \in \dot{P}_{\eta,\alpha}^M \text{”}$ then there is $r \in P_\alpha$ such that $r \restriction \eta = p$ and $p \Vdash \text{“} r \restriction [\eta, \alpha) \leq \dot{q} \text{”}$ and $r \Vdash \text{“} \omega_1 \cap M[G_{P_\alpha}] = \omega_1 \cap M \text{”}$.*

Lemma 7. *Suppose $\langle P_\xi : \xi \leq \kappa \rangle$ is a countable support iteration based on $\langle \dot{Q}_\xi : \xi < \kappa \rangle$ and P_α is strictly semi-proper for every $\alpha < \kappa$, and if $\kappa = \gamma + 1$ then $\mathbf{1} \Vdash_{P_\gamma} \text{“} \dot{Q}_\gamma \text{ is semi-proper. ”}$ Then P_κ is strictly semi-proper.*

Proof: Suppose $\lambda, \eta, M, \dot{q}$, and p are as in definition 6.

Case 1: $\gamma + 1 = \kappa$ for some γ .

Take $r_0 \in P_\gamma$ such that $r_0 \restriction \eta = p$ and $p \Vdash "r_0 \restriction [\eta, \gamma) \leq \dot{q} \restriction \gamma"$ and $r_0 \Vdash " \omega_1 \cap M[G_{P_\gamma}] = \omega_1 \cap M."$ Because $\mathbf{1} \Vdash_{P_\gamma} "\dot{Q}_\gamma$ is semi-proper," we may take $\dot{s} \in V^{P_\gamma}$ such that $\mathbf{1} \Vdash "\dot{s} \leq \dot{q}(\gamma)"$ and $\dot{s} \Vdash " \omega_1 \cap M[G_{P_\gamma}][G_{\dot{Q}_\gamma}] = \omega_1 \cap M[G_{P_\gamma}]."$ Take $r \in P_\kappa$ such that $r \restriction \gamma = r_0$ and $r(\gamma) = \dot{s}$. Then $r \Vdash " \omega_1 \cap M[G_{P_\kappa}] = \omega_1 \cap M[G_{P_\gamma}] = \omega_1 \cap M"$ and we are done.

Case 2: κ is a limit ordinal.

Let $\alpha = \sup(\kappa \cap M)$ and let $\langle \sigma_n : n \in \omega \rangle$ enumerate M^{P_κ} . Let $\langle \alpha_n : n \in \omega \rangle$ be an increasing sequence of ordinals from $\alpha \cap M$ cofinal in α such that $\alpha_0 = \eta$.

Build $\langle p_n, \dot{q}_n, \tau_n : n \in \omega \rangle$ such that $p_0 = p$ and $\dot{q}_0 = \dot{q}$ and both of the following:

- (i) $p_n \in P_{\alpha_n}$ and $p_{n+1} \restriction \alpha_n = p_n$ and $p_n \Vdash "p_{n+1} \restriction [\alpha_n, \alpha_{n+1}) \leq \dot{q}_n \restriction \alpha_{n+1}"$ and $p_n \Vdash " \omega_1 \cap M[G_{P_{\alpha_n}}] = \omega_1 \cap M"$
- (ii) $p_{n+1} \Vdash "\dot{q}_{n+1} \in \dot{P}_{\alpha_{n+1}, \kappa}^M$ and $\dot{q}_{n+1} \leq \dot{q}_n \restriction [\alpha_{n+1}, \kappa)"$ and $\dot{q}_{n+1} \Vdash$ ‘if $\sigma_n \in \omega_1$ then $\sigma_n = \check{\tau}_n$ ’ and $\tau_n \in \omega_1 \cap M[G_{P_{\alpha_{n+1}}}]$.’

This is possible by lemmas 2 and 5 and the induction hypothesis.

Now take $r \in P_\kappa$ such that $\text{supt}(r) \subseteq \alpha$ and for all $n \in \omega$ we have $r \restriction \alpha_n = p_n$. By lemma 3 we have $p_{n+1} \Vdash "\text{supt}(\dot{q}_{n+1}) \subseteq \alpha"$ and hence we have $r \restriction \alpha_{n+1} \Vdash "r \restriction [\alpha_{n+1}, \kappa) \leq \dot{q}_{n+1}."$ Therefore we have $r \restriction \alpha_{n+1} \Vdash "r \restriction [\alpha_{n+1}, \kappa) \Vdash$ ‘if $\sigma_n \in \omega_1$ then $\sigma_n \in \omega_1 \cap M[G_{P_{\alpha_{n+1}}}] = \omega_1 \cap M.$ ’” Now suppose $r_1 \leq$ and $r_1 \Vdash " \sigma \in \omega_1 \cap M[G_{P_\kappa}]."$ Take $r_2 \leq r_1$ and $n \in \omega$ such that $r_2 \Vdash " \sigma = \sigma_n."$ Then $r_2 \Vdash " \sigma \in \check{M}."$ We conclude that $r \Vdash " \omega_1 \cap M[G_{P_\kappa}] = \omega_1 \cap M."$ The lemma is established.

Lemma 8. *Suppose P_κ is strictly semi-proper. Then P_κ is semi-proper.*

Proof: Given λ sufficiently large, regular, and M a countable elementary submodel of H_{λ^+} , with $P_\kappa \in M$ and $q \in P_\kappa \cap M$, take $\eta = 0$ in definition 6. We obtain by lemma 7 a condition $r \leq q$ such that $r \Vdash \text{“}\omega_1 \cap M[G_{P_\kappa}] = \omega_1 \cap M\text{.”}$ We are done.

Theorem 9. *Suppose $\langle P_\xi : \xi \leq \kappa \rangle$ is a countable support iteration based on $\langle \dot{Q}_\xi : \xi < \kappa \rangle$, and for every $\xi < \kappa$ we have that $\mathbf{1} \Vdash_{P_\xi} \text{“}\dot{Q}_\xi \text{ is semi-proper.”}$ Then P_κ is semi-proper.*

Proof. By lemmas 7 and 8.

We now turn our attention to hemi-properness.

Definition 10. *We say that a poset P is hemi-proper iff whenever λ is an appropriately large regular cardinal and M and N are countable elementary substructures of H_λ and $P \in M \in N$ and $q \in P \cap M$, then $q \nVdash \text{“}\omega_1 \cap M[G_P] > \omega_1 \cap N\text{.”}$*

Lemma 11. *Suppose P is hemi-proper. Then P does not collapse ω_1 .*

Proof: Suppose $q \Vdash_P \text{“}\dot{f} \text{ maps } \omega \text{ onto } \omega_1^V\text{.”}$ Take M and N countable elementary substructures of some appropriate H_λ such that $\{P, q, \dot{f}\} \subseteq M \in N$. We have $q \nVdash \text{“}\omega_1 \cap M[G_P] > \omega_1 \cap N\text{.”}$ Hence $q \nVdash \text{“}\omega_1 \subseteq M[G_P]\text{,”}$ a contradiction.

Lemma 12. *If P is semi-proper, then P is hemi-proper.*

Proof: Immediate.

In theorem 19 we show that the class of hemi-proper forcings also contains Namba forcing, assuming CH, and in theorem 22 we show that $P[S]$ is hemi-proper for $S \subseteq S_0^2$ stationary.

It is instructive to see why the poset which adds a closed unbounded subset to a given stationary subset S of ω_1 using countable conditions is not hemi-proper (if it were, then our preservation theorem would contradict the fact that one can collapse ω_1 with an ω -length forcing iteration built of posets of this form). The reason is that M and N may be such that $S \cap N \cap \{\omega_1 \cap M' : M' \prec H_\lambda\} \subseteq M$.

Definition 13. Suppose $\langle P_\xi : \xi \leq \alpha \rangle$ is a countable support iteration. We say that P_α is strictly hemi-proper iff whenever λ is a sufficiently large regular cardinal and $\eta < \alpha$ and M is a countable elementary substructure of $H_{\lambda+\eta+1}$ and N is a countable elementary substructure of $H_{\lambda+\alpha+1}$ and $\{P_\alpha, \eta\} \subseteq M \in N$ and $\dot{q} \in N^{P_\eta}$ and $p \in P_\eta$ and $p \Vdash \text{“}\omega_1 \cap M[G_{P_\eta}] \leq \omega_1 \cap N \text{ and } \dot{q} \in \dot{P}_{\eta, \alpha}^M\text{”}$, then there is $r \in P_\alpha$ such that $r \restriction \eta = p$ and $p \Vdash \text{“}r \restriction [\eta, \alpha] \leq \dot{q}\text{”}$ and $r \Vdash \text{“}\omega_1 \cap M[G_{P_\alpha}] \leq \omega_1 \cap N\text{”}$.

Lemma 14. Suppose $\langle P_\xi : \xi \leq \kappa \rangle$ is a countable support iteration based on $\langle \dot{Q}_\xi : \xi < \kappa \rangle$ and P_α is strictly hemi-proper for every $\alpha < \kappa$, and if $\kappa = \gamma + 1$ then $\mathbf{1} \Vdash_{P_\gamma} \text{“}\dot{Q}_\gamma \text{ is hemi-proper.”}$ Then P_κ is strictly hemi-proper.

Proof: Suppose $\lambda, \eta, M, N, \dot{q}$, and p are as in definition 13.

Case 1: $\gamma + 1 = \kappa$ for some γ .

Take M' a countable elementary substructure of $H_{\lambda+\kappa}$ such that $M \in M' \in N$. Take $r_0 \in P_\gamma$ such that $r_0 \restriction \eta = p$ and $p \Vdash \text{“}r_0 \restriction [\eta, \gamma] \leq \dot{q} \restriction \gamma\text{”}$ and $r_0 \Vdash \text{“}\omega_1 \cap M'[G_{P_\gamma}] \leq \omega_1 \cap N\text{”}$. Because $\mathbf{1} \Vdash_{P_\gamma} \text{“}\dot{Q}_\gamma \text{ is hemi-proper,”}$ we may take $\dot{s} \in V^{P_\gamma}$ such that $\mathbf{1} \Vdash \text{“}\dot{s} \leq \dot{q}(\gamma)\text{”}$ and $\dot{s} \Vdash \text{“}\omega_1 \cap M[G_{P_\gamma}][G_{\dot{Q}_\gamma}] \leq \omega_1 \cap M'[G_{P_\gamma}]\text{”}$. Take $r \in P_\kappa$ such that $r \restriction \gamma = r_0$ and $r(\gamma) = \dot{s}$. Then

$r \Vdash \omega_1 \cap M[G_{P_\kappa}] \leq \omega_1 \cap M'[G_{P_\gamma}] \leq \omega_1 \cap N$ and we are done.

Case 2: κ is a limit ordinal.

Let $\alpha = \sup(\kappa \cap M)$ and let $\langle \sigma_n : n \in \omega \rangle$ enumerate $\{\sigma \in N^{P_\kappa} : \mathbf{1} \Vdash_{P_\kappa} \sigma \in \omega_1 \cap M[G_{P_\kappa}]\}$. Let $\langle \alpha_n : n \in \omega \rangle$ be an increasing sequence of ordinals from $\alpha \cap M$ cofinal in α such that $\alpha_0 = \eta$. Let $M_n = N \cap H_{\lambda+\alpha_{n+1}}$.

Build $\langle p_n, \dot{q}_n, \tau_n : n \in \omega \rangle$ such that $p_0 = p$ and $\dot{q}_0 = \dot{q}$ and both of the following:

- (i) $p_n \in P_{\alpha_n}$ and $p_{n+1} \restriction \alpha_n = p_n$ and $p_n \Vdash \text{``}p_{n+1} \restriction [\alpha_n, \alpha_{n+1}] \leq \dot{q}_n \restriction \alpha_{n+1}\text{''}$ and $p_n \Vdash \omega_1 \cap M[G_{P_{\alpha_n}}] \leq \omega_1 \cap M_n$
- (ii) $p_{n+1} \Vdash \text{``}\dot{q}_{n+1} \in \dot{P}_{\alpha_{n+1}, \kappa}^M \text{ and } \dot{q}_{n+1} \leq \dot{q}_n \restriction [\alpha_{n+1}, \kappa) \text{ and } \dot{q}_{n+1} \Vdash \sigma_n = \check{\tau}_n\text{''}$ and $\tau_n \in M[G_{P_{\alpha_{n+1}}}]$ and $\dot{q}_{n+1} \in N^{P_{\alpha_{n+1}}}$

This is possible by lemmas 2 and 5 and the induction hypothesis.

Now take $r \in P_\kappa$ such that $\text{supt}(r) \subseteq \alpha$ and for all $n \in \omega$ we have $r \restriction \alpha_n = p_n$. By lemma 3 we have $p_{n+1} \Vdash \text{``}\text{supt}(\dot{q}_{n+1}) \subseteq \alpha\text{''}$  and hence we have  $r \restriction \alpha_{n+1} \Vdash \text{``}r \restriction [\alpha_{n+1}, \kappa) \leq \dot{q}_{n+1}\text{''}$. Therefore we have $r \restriction \alpha_{n+1} \Vdash \text{``}r \restriction [\alpha_{n+1}, \kappa) \Vdash \sigma_n \in \omega_1 \cap M[G_{P_{\alpha_{n+1}}}] \subseteq \omega_1 \cap M_{n+1} = \omega_1 \cap N.\text{''}$ We conclude that $r \Vdash \omega_1 \cap M[G_{P_\kappa}] \subseteq \omega_1 \cap N$. The lemma is established.

Lemma 15. *Suppose P_κ is strictly hemi-proper. Then P_κ is hemi-proper.*

Proof: Given λ sufficiently large, regular, and M' and N countable elementary submodels of $H_{\lambda+\kappa+1}$, with $P_\kappa \in M' \in N$ and $q \in P_\kappa \cap M'$, take $\eta = 0$ and $M = M' \cap H_{\lambda+}$ in definition 13. We obtain by lemma 14 a condition $r \leq q$ such that $r \Vdash \omega_1 \cap M'[G_{P_\kappa}] = \omega_1 \cap M[G_{P_\kappa}] \leq \omega_1 \cap N$. We are done.

Theorem 16. *Suppose $\langle P_\xi : \xi \leq \kappa \rangle$ is a countable support iteration based on $\langle \dot{Q}_\xi : \xi < \kappa \rangle$, and for every $\xi < \kappa$ we have that $\mathbf{1} \Vdash_{P_\xi}$ “ $\dot{Q}_\xi$ is hemi-proper.” Then P_κ is hemi-proper and hence does not collapse ω_1 .*

Proof. By lemmas 14 and 15.

3 Namba forcing and the theorem of Ben-David

In this section we give an application of theorem 16. The application is to a theorem of Ben-David which is sketched in [12, theorem XI.1.7]. Because new reals are added at certain successor stages of the iteration, and possibly even at limit stages also, the preservation theorems of [12, chapter XI] are not sufficient to establish this result. The relevant preservation theorem is [12, XII.3.6, page 408].

Namba forcing, like Prikry forcing, adds no reals and changes the cofinality of some regular cardinal to ω . Whereas Prikry forcing collapses a measurable, Namba forcing collapses ω_2 . Hence iterated Namba forcing uses less extravagant large cardinal assumptions than iterated Prikry forcing, and indeed for some assertions proved consistent by Shelah using iterated Prikry forcing, Shelah later obtained equiconsistency results by using Namba forcing instead (see [12, chapters X and XI]).

Let us recall the definition of Namba forcing [9]. Let $S = \bigcup \{ {}^n \omega_2 : n \in \omega \}$ be the tree of all finite sequences of ordinals of cardinality at most $\aleph_1$.

Definition 17. *Namba forcing is the poset $\{T \subseteq S : T \text{ is non-empty and } (\forall \eta \in T)(\forall \tau \subseteq \eta)(\tau \in T) \text{ and } (\forall \eta \in T)(\text{there are } \aleph_2\text{-many } \tau \in T \text{ such that}$*

$\tau \supseteq \eta)\}$, ordered by inclusion.

Elements of Namba forcing are called *perfect subtrees* of S .

Definition 18. Suppose P is Namba forcing and G is a V -generic filter over P . Then the generic object for P is $\{\alpha \in (\omega_2)^V : (\forall T \in G)(\exists \eta \in T)(\alpha \in \text{range}(\eta))\}$.

Clearly the generic object is a countable set cofinal in $(\omega_2)^V$.

Theorem 19. Assume CH. Then Namba forcing is hemi-proper.

Proof: The proof follows Namba's proof that the forcing adds no reals (see, e.g., [3, pp. 289–291]).

Suppose $M \prec H_\lambda$ and $N \prec H_\lambda$ and q are as in definition 10. Take $f \in M$ such that f is a one-to-one map from ω_1 onto ${}^\omega 2$, and take $g \in M$ a one-to-one map from ω onto $\omega \times \omega$.

Work in N . Let $\langle \sigma_n : n \in \omega \rangle$ list M^P . Take $\langle \xi_n : n \in \omega \rangle$ a sequence from M^P such that $\mathbf{1} \Vdash_P$ “if $\sigma_n \in \omega_1$ then $\xi_{g(n,i)} = f(\sigma_n)(i)$, and in any case $\xi_{g(n,i)} \in 2$ ” for every n and i in ω . For each $n \in \omega$ construct $\mathcal{Y}_n$ and $\bar{t}_n$ such that $\mathcal{Y}_n = \langle T_s : s \in {}^n \omega_2 \rangle$ is a sequence of elements of P and $\bar{t}_n = \langle t_s : s \in {}^n \omega_2 \rangle$ is a sequence of pairwise incompatible elements of ${}^{<\omega} \omega_2$ such that $(\forall s)$ (every element of T_s is comparable with t_s) and $(\exists \alpha_s \in 2)(T_s \Vdash \text{“}\xi_n = \check{\alpha}_s\text{”})$ and $(\forall s' \subseteq s)(T_s \subseteq T_{s'})$. Because of the final clause requiring T_s to be stronger than $T_{s'}$ whenever s' is an initial segment of s , the construction actually proceeds by recursion on $n \in \omega$. In the base case, of course, we require that $T_{<>} \leq q$.

For each $n \in \omega$ define $\mathcal{T}_n$ such that $\mathcal{T}_n$ is a function with domain ${}^n 2$ such

that $(\forall \bar{\beta} \in {}^n 2)(\mathcal{T}_n(\bar{\beta}) = \bigcup \{T_s : s \in {}^n \omega_2 \text{ and } \bar{\beta}(i) = \alpha_{s \upharpoonright i} \text{ for all } i \leq n\})$. Take $\mathcal{T}'$ such that $\mathcal{T}'$ is a function with domain ${}^\omega 2$ such that $(\forall g \in {}^\omega 2)(\mathcal{T}'(g) = \bigcap \{\mathcal{T}_n(g \upharpoonright n) : n \in \omega\})$.

Claim 1. $(\exists g \in {}^\omega 2)(\mathcal{T}'(g)$ contains a perfect subtree).

Proof: Suppose not. For each $g \in {}^\omega 2$ let $T_0(g) = \mathcal{T}'(g)$ and for each α let $T_{\alpha+1}(g) = \{t \in T_\alpha(g) : t \text{ has } \aleph_2\text{-many extensions in } T_\alpha(g)\}$, and for each limit α let $T_\alpha(g) = \bigcap \{T_\beta(g) : \beta < \alpha\}$. For each $t \in \mathcal{T}'(g)$ let $h_g(t)$ be the least α such that $t \notin T_\alpha(g)$. This is defined for every $t \in \mathcal{T}'(g)$ because otherwise $\{t \in \mathcal{T}'(g) : h_g(t) \text{ is undefined}\}$ would be a perfect subtree of $\mathcal{T}'(g)$, contrary to assumption. The relevant facts about the functions h_g are that $h_g(s) \geq h_g(t)$ whenever $s \subseteq t \in \mathcal{T}'(g)$ and for each $t \in \mathcal{T}'(g)$ there are at most $\aleph_1$ -many extensions $s \supseteq t$ in $\mathcal{T}'(g)$ such that $h_g(s) = h_g(t)$. By recursion, build $s_0 \subseteq s_1 \subseteq \dots \subseteq s_n \subseteq \dots$ such that for every n we have $s_n \in {}^n \omega_2$ and $h_g(t_{s_{n+1}}) < h_g(t_{s_n})$ for every g for which $h_g(t_{s_{n+1}})$ is defined. This is possible because, by CH, there are only $\aleph_1$ -many g 's in all. Let $g_0 \in {}^\omega 2$ be defined by $g_0(n) = \alpha_{s_n}$ for all n . Then $h_{g_0}(t_{s_n})$ is defined for all n because $T_{s_n} \subseteq \mathcal{T}_{n+1}(\langle \alpha_{s_i} : i \leq n \rangle) \subseteq \mathcal{T}'(g_0)$. Thus we have a decreasing sequence of ordinals $h_{g_0}(t_{s_0}) > h_{g_0}(t_{s_1}) > \dots > h_{g_0}(t_{s_n}) > \dots$, a contradiction which establishes the claim.

Still working in N , fix g to witness the claim and take $q' \in P$ such that $\mathcal{T}'(g) \supseteq q'$. Fix $n \in \omega$. Let $\tau_n = \alpha_{g \upharpoonright n}$. We have $q' \subseteq \mathcal{T}'(g) \subseteq \mathcal{T}_n(g \upharpoonright n) \leq q$ and $X =_{\text{def}} \{T_s : s \in {}^n \omega_2\}$ is pre-dense below $\mathcal{T}_n(g \upharpoonright n)$ and $(\forall s \in X)(s \Vdash \text{"}\check{\tau}_n = g(n-1) = \xi_n\text{"})$.

We have $\langle \tau_n : n \in \omega \rangle \in N$. Hence for each $n \in \omega$ we have $\tau_n^* =_{\text{def}}$

$\langle \tau_{g(n,i)} : i \in \omega \rangle \in N$. Thus $q' \Vdash$ “if $\sigma_n \in \omega_1$ then $\sigma_n = f^{-1}(\tau_n^*) \in N$.” We have shown $(\forall \sigma \in M^P)(q' \Vdash \text{“if } \sigma \in \omega_1 \text{ then } \sigma \in N\text{”})$. Suppose $q' \nVdash \omega_1 \cap M[G_P] \subseteq N$.” Then we may take $x \in V^P$ to be a witness. In particular $q' \Vdash \text{“} x \in M[G_P]\text{”}$, so we may take $q^* \leq q'$ and $y \in M^P$ such that $q^* \Vdash \text{“} x = y\text{”}$. Then $q^* \Vdash \text{“} y \in \omega_1 \text{ and } y \notin N\text{”}$, contrary to what we have already established. This contradiction shows that $q' \Vdash \omega_1 \cap M[G_P] \subseteq N$.” Hence $q \nVdash \omega_1 \cap M[G_P] > \omega_1 \cap N$,” and we are done.

The following is due to Ben-David [12, theorem XI.1.7].

Theorem 20. *Suppose $ZFC + \text{“there is an inaccessible cardinal”}$ is consistent. Then so is $ZFC + \text{“there is no cardinal-preserving extension of the universe in which there is } A \subseteq \omega_2 \text{ such that } L[A] \models CH \text{ and } \omega_2^{L[A]} = \omega_2\text{”}$.*

Proof: Let $Col(\kappa, \lambda, \theta)$ be the poset which collapses λ to κ using conditions of size less than θ . That is, $Col(\kappa, \lambda, \theta) = \{f : \text{dom}(f) \subseteq \kappa \text{ and } \text{range}(f) \subseteq \lambda \text{ and } |f| < \theta\}$, ordered by reverse inclusion.

Begin with a ground model which satisfies $V = L$. For η a limit ordinal or zero, let $\dot{Q}_\eta$ be Cohen forcing, and let Z_η be (a name for) the corresponding generic subset of ω . For positive integer j let $\dot{Q}_{\eta+j}$ be Namba forcing iff $j \in Z_\eta$ and let $\dot{Q}_{\eta+j}$ be $Col(\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_1)$ iff $j \notin Z_\eta$. Then $L[G_{P_\kappa}] \models \text{“}(\exists \aleph_2\text{-many distinct reals } r \subseteq \omega \text{ such that there is } \lambda \text{ which is a cardinal in } L \text{ and such that } (\forall j \in \omega)(r(j) = 0 \text{ iff } \text{cf}^{L[G_{P_\kappa}]}(\lambda^{+j})^L = \omega))\text{”}$. To clarify, $(\lambda^{+j})^L$ is the j^{th} successor of λ as computed in L , and its cofinality is to be computed in $L[G_{P_\kappa}]$. Now suppose, towards a contradiction, that there is a cardinal-preserving extension $V \supseteq L[G_{P_\kappa}]$ and $A \in V$ such that $A \subseteq \omega_2^V = \kappa$ and $L[A] \models CH$ and $\omega_2^{L[A]} = \omega_2^V = \kappa$. Let $X = L_\theta[\{\delta < \omega_2^V : \text{cf}^{L[G_{P_\kappa}]}(\delta) = \omega$

and δ is a cardinal of L] where θ is some big cardinal (say, κ^+). Because L and $L[G_{P_\kappa}]$ are both subuniverses of V we know that $X \in V$. But $X = L_\theta[\{\delta < \omega_2^V : \text{cf}^V(\delta) = \omega \text{ and } \delta \text{ is a cardinal of } L\}]$ because V is a cardinal preserving extension. Because $\omega_2^{L[A]} = \omega_2^V$ we have that $\text{cf}^{L[A]}(\delta) = \text{cf}^V(\delta)$ for all $\delta < \omega_2^V$. Hence in $L[A]$ we have $\{\delta < \omega_2^{L[A]} : \text{cf}^{L[A]}(\delta) = \omega\}$ and we have $\{\delta < \omega_2^{L[A]} : \delta \text{ is a cardinal of } L\}$. From these two sets we may recover $\aleph_2^V$ -many reals (namely, $\{Z_\eta : \eta \text{ is a limit ordinal less than } \kappa\}$). Hence $L[A] \not\models CH$. This contradiction establishes the theorem.

4 $P[S]$ is hemi-proper

We show that $P[S]$ is hemi-proper. Combined with the argument of [12, section XI.7], this gives a new proof of Shelah's answer to the problem of H. Friedman [2].

Definition 21. Suppose S is a stationary subset of $S_0^2 =_{\text{def}} \{\alpha < \omega_2 : \text{cf}(\alpha) = \omega\}$. Then $P[S]$ is the poset $\{f : (\exists \beta < \omega_1)(\text{dom}(f) = \beta + 1 \text{ and } \text{range}(f) \subseteq S \text{ and } f \text{ is continuous increasing})\}$, ordered by reverse inclusion (thus the ranges of the conditions are ordered by reverse end-extension).

Theorem 22. Suppose $S \subseteq S_0^2$ is stationary. Then $P[S]$ is hemi-proper.

Proof. Suppose λ , M , N , and q are as in definition 10. Take $\mu < \lambda$ regular such that the power set of $P[S]$ is in H_μ and $\mu \in M$ and $\mu^+ < \lambda$. Take $\langle M_i : i \in \omega_2 \rangle \in N$ a continuous tower of elementary substructures of H_{μ^+} each of cardinality $\aleph_1$, such that $M \cap H_\mu \in M_0$. Take $\delta \in S \cap N$ such that $\sup(\omega_2 \cap M_\delta) = \delta$. Take $\langle \delta_n : n \in \omega \rangle$ an increasing sequence from N cofinal

in δ . Let $\langle D_n : n \in \omega \rangle$ enumerate all dense open sets of $P[S]$ which are in $N \cap M_\delta$. We may suppose that $(\forall n \in \omega)(D_n \in M_{\delta_n})$. Build $q \geq q_0 \geq q_1 \geq \dots$ such that $q_n \in D_n \cap M_{\delta_n} \cap N$ and $\sup(q_{n+1}) \geq \sup(\omega_2 \cap M_{\delta_n})$. Then let $r = \bigcup \{q_n : n \in \omega\} \cup \{\delta\}$. We have $r \Vdash "OR \cap M[G_{P[S]}] \subseteq N"$ where OR is the class of ordinals. We are done.

Theorem 23 (Shelah). *Suppose a Mahlo cardinal is consistent. Then so is the statement: Whenever S is a stationary subset of S_0^2 then S contains an uncountable sequentially closed subset.*

Proof: Combine the argument of [12, section XI.7] with our theorems 16 and 22.

5 Pseudo-completeness

In this section, we introduce the notion of μ -pseudo-completeness for μ a cardinal ($\mu = 2$ or $\mu = \text{OR}$ is allowed). This is a generalization of μ -completeness, and similar to [12, section X.3]. We then define μ -pseudo-completeness for $\dot{Q}$ relative to a poset P , in a manner reminiscent of the “not adding reals” theorem of [10]. We apply these results to iterated Namba forcing in the following section and to $P[S]$ in a later section.

Definition 24. *Suppose μ is a regular cardinal (we allow $\mu = 2$ or $\mu = \text{OR}$) and P is a poset and $\dot{Q}$ is a P -name for a poset. We say that $\dot{Q}$ is μ -pseudo-complete relative to P iff whenever λ is a sufficiently large regular cardinal and M is a countable elementary substructure of H_λ and N is a countable elementary substructure of H_{λ^+} and $\{P * \dot{Q}, \mu\} \subseteq M \in N$ and $p \in P$*

and $\dot{q} \in N^P$ and $p \Vdash \text{“}\dot{q} \in \dot{Q} \cap M[G_P]\text{”}$, then there is $\dot{r} \in V^P$ such that $p \Vdash \text{“}\dot{r} \leq \dot{q}\text{”}$ and whenever $\sigma \in N^{P*\dot{Q}}$ and $\mathbf{1} \Vdash \text{“}\sigma \in \mu \cap M[G_{P*\dot{Q}}]\text{”}$ then there is $\tau \in N^P$ such that $\mathbf{1} \Vdash_P \text{“}\tau \in M[G_P]\text{”}$ and $p \Vdash \text{“}\dot{r} \Vdash \text{‘}\sigma = \check{\tau}.\text{’}\text{”}$

Remark: If $\mu = \text{OR}$ we waive $\mu \in M$. We shall omit stating this exception in the sequel.

Definition 25. Suppose $\langle P_\xi : \xi \leq \kappa \rangle$ is a countable support iteration. We say that P_κ is strictly μ -pseudo-complete iff whenever $\eta < \kappa$ and λ is a sufficiently large regular cardinal and M is a countable elementary substructure of H_λ and N is a countable elementary substructure of H_{λ^+} and $\{P_\kappa, \mu, \eta\} \subseteq M \in N$ and $p \in P_\eta$ and $\dot{q} \in N^{P_\eta}$ and $p \Vdash_{P_\eta} \text{“}\dot{q} \in \dot{P}_{\eta, \kappa}^M\text{”}$, then there is $r \in P_\kappa$ such that $r \restriction \eta = p$ and $p \Vdash \text{“}r \restriction [\eta, \kappa) \leq \dot{q}\text{”}$ and $\text{supt}(r) \subseteq \eta \cup M$ and whenever $\sigma \in N^{P_\kappa}$ and $\mathbf{1} \Vdash \text{“}\sigma \in \mu \cap M[G_{P_\kappa}]\text{”}$ then there is $\tau \in N^{P_\eta}$ such that $\mathbf{1} \Vdash_P \text{“}\tau \in \mu \cap M[G_{P_\eta}]\text{”}$ and $p \Vdash \text{“}r \restriction [\eta, \kappa) \Vdash \text{‘}\sigma = \check{\tau}.\text{’}\text{”}$

The reason the following lemma does not contradict [5] is that definition 25 must hold even when $p \notin N$.

Lemma 26. Suppose $\langle P_\xi : \xi \leq \kappa \rangle$ is a countable support iteration based on $\langle \dot{Q}_\xi : \xi < \kappa \rangle$, and suppose P_ξ is strictly μ -pseudo-complete for every $\xi < \kappa$, and suppose that if $\kappa = \gamma + 1$ then $\dot{Q}_\gamma$ is μ -pseudo-complete relative to P_γ . Then P_κ is strictly μ -pseudo-complete.

Proof: Suppose $\lambda, \eta, M, N, \dot{q}$, and p are as in definition 25.

Case 1: $\gamma + 1 = \kappa$ for some γ .

We may take $r_0 \in P_\gamma$ such that $r_0 \restriction \eta = p$ and $p \Vdash \text{“}r_0 \restriction [\eta, \gamma) \leq \dot{q} \restriction \gamma\text{”}$ and $\text{supt}(r_0) \subseteq \eta \cup M$ and whenever $\sigma \in N^{P_\gamma}$ there is $\tau \in N^{P_\eta}$ such that if

$\mathbf{1} \Vdash \text{"}\sigma \in \mu \cap M[G_{P_\gamma}]\text{"}$ then $\mathbf{1} \Vdash \text{"}\tau \in \mu \cap M[G_{P_\eta}]\text{"}$ and $p \Vdash \text{"}r_0 \restriction [\eta, \gamma) \Vdash \text{"}\sigma = \check{\tau}.\text{"}$ Take $\dot{s} \in V^{P_\gamma}$ such that $r_0 \Vdash_{P_\gamma} \text{"}\dot{s} \leq \dot{q}(\gamma)\text{"}$ and for every $\sigma \in N^{P_\kappa}$ such that if $\mathbf{1} \Vdash \text{"}\sigma \in \mu \cap M[G_{P_\kappa}]\text{"}$ there is $\tau \in N^{P_\gamma}$ such that $\mathbf{1} \Vdash \text{"}\tau \in \mu \cap M[G_{P_\gamma}]\text{"}$ and $r_0 \Vdash \text{"}\dot{s} \Vdash \text{"}\sigma = \check{\tau}.\text{"}$ Take $r \in P_\kappa$ such that $r \restriction \gamma = r_0$ and $r(\gamma) = \dot{s}$. Then r is as required.

Case 2: κ is a limit ordinal.

Let $\langle \sigma_n : n \in \omega \rangle$ list $\{\sigma \in N^{P_\kappa} : \mathbf{1} \Vdash \text{"}\sigma \in \mu \cap M[G_{P_\kappa}]\text{"}\}$. Let $\alpha = \sup(\kappa \cap M)$, and let $\langle \alpha_n : n \in \omega \rangle$ be an increasing sequence of ordinals from $\alpha \cap M$ cofinal in α such that $\alpha_0 = \eta$.

Build $\langle p_n, \dot{q}_n, \tau_n : n \in \omega \rangle$ such that $p_0 = p$ and $\dot{q}_0 = \dot{q}$ and both of the following:

(i) $p_n \Vdash_{P_{\alpha_n}} \text{"}\dot{q}_{n+1} \leq \dot{q}_n \restriction [\alpha_n, \kappa)\text{"}$ and $\dot{q}_{n+1} \in \dot{P}_{\alpha_n, \kappa}^M$ and $\dot{q}_{n+1} \Vdash \text{"}\sigma_n = \check{\tau}_n\text{"}$ and $\tau_n \in N^{P_{\alpha_n}}$ and $\dot{q}_{n+1} \in N^{P_{\alpha_n}}$

(ii) $p_n \in P_{\alpha_n}$ and $p_{n+1} \restriction \alpha_n = p_n$ and $\text{supt}(p_{n+1}) \subseteq \eta \cup M$ and $p_n \Vdash \text{"}p_{n+1} \restriction [\alpha_n, \alpha_{n+1}) \leq \dot{q}_{n+1} \restriction \alpha_{n+1}\text{"}$ and whenever $\sigma \in N^{P_{\alpha_{n+1}}}$ and $\mathbf{1} \Vdash \text{"}\sigma \in \mu \cap M[G_{P_{\alpha_{n+1}}}]\text{"}$ there is $\tau \in N^{P_{\alpha_n}}$ such that $\mathbf{1} \Vdash \text{"}\tau \in \mu \cap M[G_{P_{\alpha_n}}]\text{"}$ and $p_{n+1} \Vdash \text{"}\sigma = \check{\tau}\text{"}$

We may choose $\dot{q}_{n+1}$ and τ_n as in (i) by lemma 2. We may choose p_{n+1} as in (ii) by the fact that $P_{\alpha_{n+1}}$ is strictly μ -pseudo-complete.

Now take $r \in P_\kappa$ such that $\text{supt}(r) \subseteq \alpha$ and for all $n \in \omega$ we have $r \restriction \alpha_n = p_n$. The lemma is established.

Theorem 27. Suppose $\langle P_\xi : \xi \leq \kappa \rangle$ is a countable support iteration based on $\langle \dot{Q}_\xi : \xi < \kappa \rangle$, and for every $\xi < \kappa$ we have that $\dot{Q}_\xi$ is μ -pseudo-complete relative to P_ξ . Then P_κ does not add any elements of ${}^\omega \mu$.

Proof. By lemma 26 we have that P_κ is strictly μ -pseudo-complete. Take $\eta = 0$ in definition 25.

6 Namba forcing is μ -pseudo-complete ($\mu \in \{2, \omega\}$)

We now investigate applications of theorem 27. It is easy to show that if $\mu < \mu^*$ are cardinals and $\mathbf{1} \Vdash_P \text{“}\mu^* \text{ is measurable and } \dot{Q} \text{ is Prikry forcing on } \mu^* \text{ (more exactly, on some fixed normal measure over } \mu^*)\text{”}$ then $\dot{Q}$ is μ -pseudo-complete relative to P .

Lemma 28. *Suppose P is a poset which does not add reals and $\mathbf{1} \Vdash_P \text{“}\dot{Q} \text{ is Namba forcing.”}$ Suppose also CH holds in the ground model and $\mu \in \{2, \omega\}$. Then $\dot{Q}$ is μ -pseudo-complete relative to P .*

Proof: As in theorem 19, we modify slightly the argument of [9], [3, pp. 289–291]. Suppose $M \prec H_\lambda$ and $N \prec H_{\lambda^+}$ and $p \in P$ and $\dot{q} \in N^P$ are as in definition 24. Let $\langle \sigma_n : n \in \omega \rangle$ list $\{\sigma \in N^{P \ast \dot{Q}} : \mathbf{1} \Vdash \text{“}\sigma \in \mu\text{”}\}$. Take $\dot{\beta} \in M^P$ such that $\mathbf{1} \Vdash_P \text{“}\dot{\beta} = (\omega_2)^{V[G_P]}\text{”}$ (notice that we allow the possibility of $p_1 \in P$ and $p_2 \in P$ and $\beta_1 \neq \beta_2$ such that $p_1 \Vdash \text{“}\beta_1 = (\omega_2)^{V[G_P]}\text{”}$ and $p_2 \Vdash \text{“}\beta_2 = (\omega_2)^{V[G_P]}\text{”}$). By recursion on $n \in \omega$ construct $\mathcal{Y}_n \in N^P$ and $\bar{t}_n \in N^P$ such that $\mathbf{1} \Vdash_P \text{“if } \dot{q} \in \dot{Q} \cap M[G_P] \text{ then } \mathcal{Y}_n = \langle T_s : s \in {}^n \dot{\beta} \rangle \text{ is a sequence of elements of } \dot{Q} \text{ and } \bar{t}_n = \langle t_s : s \in {}^n \dot{\beta} \rangle \text{ is a sequence of pairwise incompatible elements of } {}^{<\omega} \dot{\beta} \text{ such that } (\forall s)(\text{every element of } T_s \text{ is comparable with } t_s) \text{ and } (\exists \alpha_s \in \mu)(T_s \Vdash \text{“}\sigma_n \in \mu \text{ implies } \sigma_n = \alpha_s\text{”}) \text{ and } (\forall s' \subseteq s)(T_s \subseteq T_{s'}); \text{”}$ also $\mathbf{1} \Vdash_P \text{“if } \dot{q} \in \dot{Q} \cap M[G_P] \text{ then } T_{<\omega} \leq \dot{q} \text{.”}$ Furthermore, we may assume that $\bar{\alpha}_n$ is a name such that $\mathbf{1} \Vdash_P \text{“}\bar{\alpha}_n = \langle \alpha_s : s \in {}^n \dot{\beta} \rangle \text{ as in the preceding}$

construction” and $\bar{\alpha}_n \in N^P$.

For each $n \in \omega$ define $\mathcal{T}_n \in N^P$ such that $\mathbf{1} \Vdash_P$ “ $\mathcal{T}_n$ is a function with domain ${}^n\mu$ such that $(\forall \bar{\beta} \in {}^n\mu)(\mathcal{T}_n(\bar{\beta}) = \bigcup \{T_s : s \in {}^n\dot{\beta} \text{ and } \bar{\beta}(i) = \alpha_s \upharpoonright_i \text{ for all } i \leq n\}$.” We have stayed within the confines of N^P as long as possible; now we start making names which are in V^P . Take $\mathcal{T}' \in V^P$ such that $\mathbf{1} \Vdash_P$ “ $\mathcal{T}'$ is a function with domain ${}^\omega\mu$ such that $(\forall g \in {}^\omega\mu)(\mathcal{T}'(g) = \bigcap \{\mathcal{T}_n(g \upharpoonright n) : n \in \omega\})$.”

Claim: $(\exists g \in {}^\omega\mu)(\mathbf{1} \Vdash$ “if $\dot{q} \in \dot{Q} \cap M[G_P]$ then $\mathcal{T}'(\check{g})$ contains a perfect subtree”).

Proof: Suppose not. We have $(\forall g \in {}^\omega\mu)(\mathbf{1} \nVdash$ “if $\dot{q} \in \dot{Q} \cap M[G_P]$ then $\mathcal{T}'(\check{g})$ contains a perfect subtree”). Because P adds no reals, we may take $q_2 \in P$ such that $q_2 \Vdash$ “ $\dot{q} \in \dot{Q} \cap M[G_P]$ and $(\forall g \in {}^\omega\mu)(\mathcal{T}'(g)$ does not contain a perfect subtree).” Take G_P to be V -generic over P such that $q_2 \in G_P$. Using theorem 19 (claim 1) in the model $V[G_P]$ we obtain a contradiction (literally so if $\mu = 2$, but if $\mu = \omega$ then rewrite the proof of that claim with ω replacing 2).

Fix g to witness the claim and take $\dot{q}_1 \in V^P$ such that $\mathbf{1} \Vdash_P$ “if $\dot{q} \in \dot{Q} \cap M[G_P]$ then $\mathcal{T}'(\check{g}) \supseteq \dot{q}_1$ and $\dot{q}_1 \in \dot{Q}$.” Given $\sigma \in N^{P*\dot{Q}}$ such that $\mathbf{1} \Vdash$ “ $\sigma \in \mu$,” take n such that $\sigma = \sigma_{n-1}$. We seek $\tau \in N^P$ such that $p \Vdash$ “ $\dot{q}_1 \Vdash$ ‘ $\sigma = \check{\tau}$.’” Take $\tau \in N^P$ such that $\mathbf{1} \Vdash_P$ “ $\tau = \alpha_g \upharpoonright_n$.” Although g need not be in N , certainly $g \upharpoonright n \in N$, so there is no problem in choosing such a τ . We have $p \Vdash$ “ $\dot{q}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{T}'(\check{g}) \subseteq \mathcal{T}_n(\check{g} \upharpoonright n)$ and $X =_{\text{def}} \{T_s : s \in {}^n\dot{\beta}\}$ is pre-dense below $\mathcal{T}_n(\check{g} \upharpoonright n)$ and $(\forall \dot{s} \in X)(\dot{s} \Vdash$ ‘ $\check{\tau} = \check{g}(n-1) = \sigma$ ’).” The lemma is established.

7 Applications

In this section we give several applications of iterated Namba forcing. All of these are taken from [12, chapter XI] and are included merely for the sake of completeness. Our first application is [12, theorem XI.1.5]. Our proof is the same as the one given by Shelah, except of course that he uses revised countable support iterations and he intersperses cardinal collapses among the Namba forcings, as required by his preservation theorem. The converse of the theorem had earlier been proved by Avraham, so that this is an equiconsistency result.

Theorem 29 (Shelah). *Suppose $ZFC +$ “there exists an inaccessible cardinal” is consistent. Then so is $ZFC + GCH + (\forall X \subseteq \omega_1)(\exists Y \in [\omega_2]^\omega)(Y \notin L[X])$.*

Proof: Start with a ground model of $ZFC + GCH + \kappa$ is inaccessible. Form a countable support iteration of length κ such that each constituent poset is Namba forcing. Clearly $\omega_1^V = \omega_1^{V[G_{P_\kappa}]}$ and $\kappa = \omega_2^{V[G_{P_\kappa}]}$, and GCH holds in V^{P_κ} . Suppose $X \in V[G_{P_\kappa}]$ and $V[G_{P_\kappa}] \models “|X| = \aleph_1.”$ Take $\alpha < \kappa$ such that $X \in V[G_{P_\alpha}]$. In $V[G_{P_\kappa}]$ let Y be the generic object for $\dot{Q}_\alpha$. Then we have $Y \notin V[G_{P_\alpha}]$, but $L[X] \subseteq V[G_{P_\alpha}]$. Thus Y exemplifies what is required, and the theorem is established.

The following theorem is [12, theorem XI.1.6]. Again, we add nothing new (we include it for expository purposes) except that our iteration of Namba forcings uses countable support iteration and does not need the other σ -closed cardinal collapses. Avraham has proved the converse, so this

theorem is an equiconsistency result.

Theorem 30 (Shelah). *Suppose $ZFC +$ “there is a Mahlo cardinal” is consistent. Then so is $ZFC + GCH + (\forall A \subseteq \omega_1)(\exists \delta > \omega)(\text{cf}(\delta) = \omega \text{ and } \delta \text{ is a regular cardinal in } L[A \cap \delta])$.*

Proof: Start with a ground model satisfying $ZFC + GCH + \kappa$ is Mahlo. Form a countable support iteration of length κ using Namba forcings. Given $A \in V^{P_\kappa}$ such that $\mathbf{1} \Vdash “A \subseteq \omega_1,”$ take $C \subseteq \kappa$ closed unbounded such that whenever $i < j$ are both in C then $A \cap i \in V^{P_j}$. Take C' a closed unbounded set such that every element of C' is a limit point of C , and such that $A \in V^{P_\eta}$ where $\eta = \min(C')$. Then we have that $(\forall \delta \in C')(A \cap \delta \in V^{P_\delta})$. Since κ is Mahlo, we may take $\lambda \in C'$ such that λ is inaccessible. We have that P_λ has λ -c.c., hence $\omega_2^{P_\lambda} = \lambda$. Let Y be the generic object for $\dot{Q}_\lambda$. Then $V^{P_\kappa} \models “Y$ is cofinal in λ hence $\text{cf}(\lambda) = \omega.”$ Yet λ is regular in $L[A \cap \lambda]$ because $L[A \cap \lambda] \subseteq V^{P_\lambda}$ and $V^{P_\lambda} \models “\lambda \text{ is regular.”$ The theorem is established.

We now give another application of iterated Namba forcing from Shelah’s book. Once again, this is for expository purposes; however, we use an argument from [4] rather than the argument used in [12].

Definition 31. *Suppose $\mathcal{F}$ is a filter over κ . Then the poset $PP(\mathcal{F})$ is $\{X \subseteq \kappa : \kappa - X \notin \mathcal{F}\}$, ordered by inclusion.*

Definition 32. *Suppose $\mathcal{F}$ is a filter over κ . We say $\mathcal{F}$ is precipitous iff $\mathbf{1} \Vdash_{PP(\mathcal{F})} “V^\kappa/E \text{ is well-founded where } E \text{ is } PP(\mathcal{F})\text{-generic over } V.”$*

Lemma 33. *Suppose $\langle P_\alpha : \alpha \leq \kappa \rangle$ is a forcing iteration such that $(\forall \alpha < \kappa)(|P_\alpha| < \kappa)$ and $(\forall p \in P_\kappa)(\text{supt}(p) \text{ is bounded below } \kappa)$ and U is a normal*

measure on κ and $\mathbf{1} \Vdash_{P_\kappa}$ “ $\mathcal{F}$ is the filter generated by $\check{U}$.” Then $\mathbf{1} \Vdash_{P_\kappa}$ “ $\mathcal{F}$ is precipitous.”

Remark: [3, page 592] attributes the following argument, which is the first half of [4, theorem 3], to Mitchell, but there Levy forcing is used in place of the κ -length iteration, and the filter is constructed over ω_1 instead of ω_2 . A different argument, based on [8], is used by Shelah [12, theorem XI.1.7].

Proof: Let $j : V \mapsto V^\kappa/U$ be the canonical embedding and let $G = G_{P_\kappa}$ be the canonical name for the generic filter on P_κ . Because $(\forall \alpha < \kappa)(|P_\alpha| < \kappa)$ we have that $j(P_\kappa) = P_{j(\kappa)} = P_\kappa * \dot{P}_{\kappa, j(\kappa)}$. Let $G^* = G_{j(P_\kappa)}$ be the canonical name for the generic filter on $j(P_\kappa)$. In $V^{j(P_\kappa)}$ we have $G = G^* \cap P_\kappa$. Let $j^* \in V^{P_\kappa}$ be a name for the elementary embedding from $V[G]$ into $(V^\kappa/U)[G^*]$ which extends j and such that $j^*(G) = G^*$. Actually of course j^* is a propewr class and therefore not literally an element of V^{P_κ} but this need not concern us unduly. We shall use standard facts about j^* which can be found in [7], [3, chapters 36 and 37].

Claim 1. Suppose $y \in V^{P_\kappa}$ and $p \in P_\kappa$. Then $(\exists X \in U)(p \Vdash_{P_\kappa} “y \supseteq \check{X}”) \text{ iff } j(p) \Vdash_{j(P_\kappa)} “\kappa \in j^*(y).”$

Proof: Suppose first that $j(p) \Vdash_{j(P_\kappa)} “\kappa \in j^*(y).”$ Let $X = \{\alpha < \kappa : p \Vdash “\alpha \in y”\}$. By normality of U our hypothesis implies $X \in U$ (see [7]). But $p \Vdash “\check{X} \subseteq y”$ by the definition of X . In the converse direction, suppose $Z \in U$ and $p \Vdash “\check{Z} \subseteq y”$ and $q \leq j(p)$. It suffices to find $q^* \leq q$ such that $q^* \Vdash “\kappa \in j^*(y).”$ Let $q' = q \restriction \kappa \in P_\kappa$. We have $\mathbf{1} \Vdash_{j(P_\kappa)} “\kappa \in j^*(\check{Z})”$ by normality of U . Also, $j(q') \Vdash_{j(P_\kappa)} “\kappa \in j^*(y),”$ because $q' \Vdash “\check{Z} \subseteq y.”$ Take

q^* such that $q^* \restriction \kappa = q'$ and $q^* \restriction [\kappa, j(\kappa)) = q \restriction [\kappa, j(\kappa))$. Because $\text{supt}(q') \subseteq \gamma$ for some $\gamma < \kappa$ we have $\text{supt}(j(q')) \subseteq \gamma$ and hence $q^* \in j(P_\kappa)$ and $q^* \leq q$ and $q^* \leq j(q')$. We have $q^* \Vdash \text{"}\kappa \in j^*(\check{Z}) \subseteq j^*(y)\text{"}$. The claim is established.

Suppose $p \in P_\kappa$ and $p \Vdash \text{"}x \in PP(\mathcal{F})\text{"}$. We show there is $q \leq p$ and $D \in V^{P_\kappa}$ such that $q \Vdash \text{"}x \in D \text{ and } D \text{ is } PP(\mathcal{F})\text{-generic and } V[G]^\kappa/D \text{ is wellfounded,}"$ which suffices to establish the lemma. (Remark: It suffices to find such a D in $V[G][G_{PP(\mathcal{F})}]$. It may therefore seem surprising that we obtain such a D in $V[G]$. This occurs essentially because in the ground model V we have $U \in V$ is $PP(U)$ -generic over V , and since P_κ has κ -c.c., we have moved to a situation which is not too far removed from the situation in the ground model.) By the definition of $PP(\mathcal{F})$ we have $p \Vdash_{P_\kappa} \text{"}\kappa - x \notin \mathcal{F}\text{"}$. Hence $p \nVdash \text{"}\mathbf{1} \restriction \dot{P}_{\kappa, j(\kappa)} \text{'}\kappa \in j^*(\kappa - x)\text{'}\text{"}$. Take $p_1 \leq p$ such that $p_1 \Vdash \text{"}\mathbf{1} \nVdash \text{'}\kappa \in j^*(\kappa - x)\text{'}\text{"}$. Take $q_1 \in j(P_\kappa)$ with $q_1 \restriction \kappa \leq p_1$ and $q_1 \Vdash \text{"}\kappa \notin j^*(\kappa - x)\text{"}$. Take $q_2 \leq q_1$ such that $q_2 \Vdash \text{"}\kappa \in j^*(x)\text{"}$. Define $D \in V^{P_\kappa}$ to be a name for $\{y \subseteq \kappa : q_2 \restriction [\kappa, j(\kappa)) \Vdash_{\dot{P}_{\kappa, j(\kappa)}} \text{"}\kappa \in j^*(y)\text{"}\}$ and let $q = q_2 \restriction \kappa$. We show that q and D satisfies the requirements.

By claim 1 we have that $V[G] \models \text{"}\mathcal{F} \text{ is normal and } D \supseteq \mathcal{F} \text{ because } (\forall X \subseteq \kappa)(X \in \mathcal{F} \text{ iff } \mathbf{1} \restriction \dot{P}_{\kappa, j(\kappa)} \text{'}\kappa \in j^*(X)\text{'})\text{"}$, using once again the fact that $\text{supt}(j(p')) \subseteq \kappa$ whenever $p' \in P_\kappa$.

Continuing the verification of the requisite properties of q and D , we have by choice of q_2 that $q_2 \Vdash \text{"}\kappa \in j^*(x)\text{"}$. Thus $q \Vdash \text{"}x \in D\text{"}$ by the definition of D . Furthermore, $q \Vdash \text{"}(V[G])^\kappa/D \text{ is well-founded because } \mathbf{1} \restriction \dot{P}_{\kappa, j(\kappa)} \text{'}(V[G])^\kappa/D \text{ is isomorphic to the well-founded structure } (V^\kappa/U)[G^*] \text{ via the isomorphism } \pi([f]) = j^*(f)(\kappa)\text{'}\text{"}$. So it remains to show $q \Vdash \text{"}D \text{ is } PP(\mathcal{F})\text{-}$

generic.”

Suppose, towards a contradiction, that $A \in V^{P_\kappa}$ and $q' \leq q$ and $q' \Vdash “A \subseteq PP(\mathcal{F})$ and $A \cap D = \emptyset$ and A is dense in $PP(\mathcal{F})$.” Let $q_3 \in P_{j(\kappa)}$ be defined by $q_3 \restriction \kappa = q'$ and $q_3 \restriction [\kappa, j(\kappa)) = q_2 \restriction [\kappa, j(\kappa))$.

Claim 2. $q_3 \Vdash “(\forall a \in A)(\kappa \notin j^*(a))$.”

Proof: Suppose instead that $q_4 \leq q_3$ and $a \in V^{P_\kappa}$ and $q_4 \Vdash “a \in A$ and $\kappa \in j^*(a)$.” Then $q_4 \restriction \kappa \not\Vdash “q_2 \restriction [\kappa, j(\kappa)) \not\Vdash ‘\kappa \in j^*(a)’$.” Hence $q_4 \restriction \kappa \not\Vdash “a \notin D$,” a contradiction to the fact that $q' \Vdash “A \cap D = \emptyset$ ”.

Take $\bar{g} = \langle g_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa \rangle$ such that $[\bar{g}]_U = q_3$ and each g_α maps κ into P_κ . Take $T \in V^{P_\kappa}$ such that $\mathbf{1} \Vdash “T = \{\alpha < \kappa : g_\alpha \in G\}$.” Because $q_3 \Vdash “q_3 \in G^* = j^*(G)”$ we have $q_3 \Vdash “\{\alpha < j(\kappa) : \alpha \in j(T)\} \in j(U)”$ and hence $q_3 \restriction \kappa \not\Vdash “\{\alpha < \kappa : \alpha \in T\} \notin U$.” Hence we may take $q_4 \leq q_3$ such that $q_4 \Vdash “\kappa \in j^*(T)”$. Hence $q_4 \restriction \kappa \not\Vdash “\kappa - T \in \mathcal{F}$.” Therefore we may take $q_5 \leq q_4 \restriction \kappa$ such that $q_5 \Vdash “\kappa - T \notin \mathcal{F}$.” Because $q_5 \Vdash “A$ is dense in $PP(\mathcal{F})$,” we may take $q_6 \leq q_5$ and $a \in V^{P_\kappa}$ such that $q_6 \Vdash “a \in A$ and $\kappa - (a \cap T) \notin \mathcal{F}$.” We have $q_6 \not\Vdash “\mathbf{1} \restriction \dot{P}_{\kappa, j(\kappa)} \restriction \kappa \in j^*(\kappa - (a \cap T))$.” Because a and T are in V^{P_κ} we have $q_6 \Vdash “\mathbf{1} \restriction \dot{P}_{\kappa, j(\kappa)} \restriction \kappa \in j^*(\kappa - (a \cap T))”$ hence we may take $q_7 \leq q_6$ such that $q_7 \Vdash “\mathbf{1} \restriction \dot{P}_{\kappa, j(\kappa)} \restriction \kappa \notin j^*(\kappa - (a \cap T))$.” Using the fact that $q_4 \Vdash “\kappa \in j^*(T)”$ we have $q_7 \not\Vdash “\kappa \notin j^*(a)”$, contradicting claim 2. The lemma is established.

The following is [12, theorem XI.1.7].

Theorem 34 (Shelah). *Suppose ZFC+ “there is a measurable cardinal” is consistent. Then so is ZFC+GCH+ “there is a normal precipitous filter D over ω_2 such that $S_0^2 = \{\alpha < \omega_2 : \text{cf}(\alpha) = \omega\} \in D$.”*

Proof: Begin with a model of ZFC+GCH in which κ is a measurable cardinal. Form a countable support iteration $\langle P_\eta : \eta \leq \kappa \rangle$ with $\mathbf{1} \Vdash_{P_\eta} \dot{Q}_\eta$ is Namba forcing” for every $\eta < \kappa$. Let U be a normal measure on κ and let $Y = \{\alpha < \kappa : \alpha \text{ is strongly inaccessible}\}$. By lemma 33, $\mathbf{1} \Vdash_{P_\kappa} \mathcal{F}$ is precipitous, where $\mathcal{F}$ is the filter generated by $\check{U}$. Thus it suffices to show $\mathbf{1} \Vdash_{P_\kappa} \{\alpha < \omega_2^{V[G_{P_\kappa}]} = \kappa : \text{cf}(\alpha) = \omega\} \supseteq \check{Y}$. But all that is needed to see this is to notice that if α is strongly inaccessible then we have that P_α has α -c.c., and so $\mathbf{1} \Vdash_{P_\alpha} \alpha = \omega_2^{V[G_{P_\alpha}]}$ and so $\dot{Q}_\alpha$ adds a countable sequence cofinal in α . The theorem is established.

8 $P[S]$ is pseudo-complete

In this section we establish that $P[S]$ is μ -pseudo-complete for $\mu = OR$. For $p \in P[S]$, we set $\text{ht}(p) = \max(\text{dom}(p))$, i.e., $\text{dom}(p) = \text{ht}(p) + 1$.

Theorem 35. *Suppose $\dot{Q}$ is a P -name and $\mathbf{1} \Vdash_P \dot{Q} = P[\dot{S}]$ for some stationary $\dot{S} \subseteq S_0^2$ and CH holds.” Then $\dot{Q}$ is μ -pseudo-complete relative to P for every regular μ including $\mu = OR$.*

Proof: Suppose $P * \dot{Q} \in M \prec H_\lambda$ and $N \prec H_{\lambda^+}$ with $M \in N$ both countable, and $(p, \dot{q}) \in P * \dot{Q}$ and $\dot{q} \in N^P$, as in definition 24. Let $\langle \sigma_n : n \in \omega \rangle$ list $\{\sigma \in N^P : \mathbf{1} \Vdash \sigma \in M[G_P] \text{ and } \sigma \text{ is an ordinal}\}$. Build $\{J_n : n \in \omega\} \subseteq N^P$ by recursion on n such that for each $n \in \omega$ we have $\mathbf{1} \Vdash_P J_n \subseteq \dot{Q}$ and $(\forall x \in J_n)(\exists \eta < \text{ht}(x))(x \restriction \eta \in J_{n-1})$ and $(\forall t \in J_{n-1})(|\{x \in J_n : x \restriction \text{dom}(t) = t\}| = \aleph_2)$ and $(\forall x \in J_n)(\exists \tau \in \mu)(x \restriction \tau \Vdash_{\dot{Q}} \text{‘if } \sigma_n \in \mu \text{ then } \sigma_n = \check{\tau}\text{’})$. Take $\tau_n \in N^P$ such that $\mathbf{1} \Vdash_P (\forall x \in J_n)(x \restriction \tau_n \Vdash \text{‘if } \sigma_n \in \mu \text{ then } \sigma_n = \check{\tau}_n\text{’})$. By the

fact that $\mathbf{1} \Vdash_P$ “CH holds,” we may take $C \in V^P$ such that $\mathbf{1} \Vdash$ “ $C \subseteq \omega_2$ is closed unbounded and whenever $\delta \in C$ and $x \in \bigcup\{J_n : n \in \omega\}$ and $\sup(\text{range}(x)) < \delta$ then there are $\beta < \delta$ and $y \in \bigcup\{J_n : n \in \omega\}$ such that $y \restriction \text{dom}(x) = x$ and $y(\text{dom}(x)) = \beta$.”

Take $\delta \in V^P$ such that $\mathbf{1} \Vdash$ “ $\delta \in C \cap \dot{S}$ and $\sup(\text{range}(\dot{q}) < \delta$.” Also suppose $\mathbf{1} \Vdash$ “ $\langle \delta_n : n \in \omega \rangle$ is an increasing sequence cofinal in δ .” By recursion on $n \in \omega$ build $\{\dot{q}_n : n \in \omega\} \subseteq V^P$ such that $\mathbf{1} \Vdash$ “if $\dot{q} \in \dot{Q} \cap M[G_P]$ then $\dot{q}_0 = \dot{q}$ and $\dot{q}_{n+1} \leq \dot{q}_n$ and $\dot{q}_n \in J_n$ and $\delta_n < \sup(\text{range}(\dot{q}_n)) < \delta$.” Take $\dot{r} \in V^P$ such that $\mathbf{1} \Vdash$ “ $\dot{r} \in \dot{Q}$ and $\text{range}(\dot{r}) = \bigcup\{\text{range}(\dot{q}_n) : n \in \omega\} \cup \{\delta\}$.” Clearly $\dot{r}$ is as required.

Theorem 36 (Shelah). *Suppose it is consistent that there is a Mahlo cardinal. Then it is consistent that GCH holds and whenever $S \subseteq S_0^2$ is stationary, then S contains an uncountable sequentially closed subset.*

Proof: The argument given by Shelah in [12, section XI.7] can be used, but with the use of our preservation theorem to simplify the main lemma there.

As a final comment, let us remark that the proof of [11, lemma 7] is incorrect.

References

- [1] Baumgartner, J., “Iterated Forcing” in *Surveys in Set Theory*, A.R.D. Mathias (ed.), Cambridge University Press, 1979
- [2] Friedman, H., “One hundred and two problems in mathematical logic,” *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, **40**, pp. 113–129, 1975

- [3] Jech, T., *Set Theory*, Academic Press, 1978
- [4] Jech, T., M. Magidor, W. Mitchell, and K. Prikry, “Precipitous ideals,” *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, vol. **45**, pp. 1–8, 1980
- [5] Jensen, R., and H. Johnsbråten, “A new construction of a non-constructible Δ_3^1 subset of ω ,” *Fundamenta Mathematicae*, vol. **81**, pp. 279–290, 1974
- [6] Kunen, K., *Set Theory, an Introduction to Independence Proofs*, North-Holland, 1980
- [7] Kunen, K., and J. Paris, “Boolean extensions and measurable cardinals,” *Annals of Mathematical Logic* vol. **2**, pp. 359–378, 1971
- [8] Magidor, M., “Precipitous ideals and Σ_4^1 sets,” *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, vol. **35**, pp. 109–134, 1980
- [9] Namba, K., “Independence proof of (ω, ω_α) -distributive law in complete Boolean algebras,” *Comment Math. Univ. St. Pauli*, vol. **19**, pp. 1–12, 1970
- [10] Schlindwein, C., “Consistency of Suslin’s hypothesis, a non-special Aronszajn tree, and GCH,” *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, vol. **59**, pp. 1–29, 1994
- [11] Schlindwein, C., “Simplified RCS iterations,” *Archive for Mathematical Logic*, vol. **32**, pp. 341–349, 1993
- [12] Shelah, S., *Proper Forcing*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics **940**, Springer-Verlag, 1982